

# VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

ORSON S. MURRAY, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."

EPHRAIM MAXHAM, PRINTER.

VOLUME VIII.

BRANDON, THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1836.

NUMBER 32.

## TERMS OF THE TELEGRAPH.

\*The VERMONT TELEGRAPH is published weekly at \$2 a year, payable within four months, or \$2.50 at the end of the year.

To subscribers out of the State, residing more than 100 miles from this office, the paper will be sent for \$1.75.

To companies, at whatever distance, who receive 12 or more copies in one bundle, and pay in advance, \$1.50 each.

Agents, who procure and pay for six subscribers, are entitled to the seventh copy gratis.

In making communications of new subscribers and remittances, the Agents will be particular in giving the names and residences of subscribers, and the amount to be credited to each.

All Baptist ministers, in good standing in the churches throughout the United States, are authorized to act as agents for this paper.

(3) All communications must be post paid, except such as add to our list of subscribers one or more names.

Papers will not be discontinued until all arrears are paid, except at the discretion of the publisher.

## FOR THE TELEGRAPH.

### "REMEMBER ME."

To my friend B. E.

Remember me—but not to men,  
Who flatter only to betray,  
Who utter falsehood and again,  
Repeat the slander of the day;  
Who cover before the oppressor's frown,  
And court the great so cringingly;  
But tread the poor and helpless down;  
To such O, don't remember me.

Remember me—but not to those,  
Who never felt another's grief,  
Whose heart with friendship never glows  
Nor feel it joy to give relief;  
But when you meet a friend of mine  
Who loves so true—so ardently—  
Who feels a friendship just like mine—  
Then greet him, and remember me.

Remember me—not at the hour,  
When passion's host has thrown her spell;  
And thou art languored by the power,  
Of—what wouldst thou should I tell—  
But, when a victor, thou art last,  
Regain thy lost tranquillity,  
With deep repentance for the past,  
O! then, I pray, remember me.

Remember me—but not when thou,  
Encircled by a joyous throng,  
Shalt at the shrine of beauty bow,  
Or listen to the festive song;  
"But when the thoughtless crowd are gone,"  
"And hushed the noise of senseless glee,"  
And thy young heart is still and lone—  
In silence, then—remember me.

Remember me—but not with loud  
And boisterous mirth—too joyously—  
While thy bright sun without a cloud,  
Rides proudly up thy morning sky;  
But when the shades of life appear,  
And earthly scenes are dark to thee,  
And thou art grieved and sad and drear—  
Ah! then you may remember me.

Remember me—but not till thou  
Hast sought and found—thy sins forgiven—  
In much submission lowly bow,  
And pressing on thy way to Heaven;  
Then, while repentant tears shall flow,  
And joy shall bid thy sorrow flee,  
With holy love thy bosom glow,  
O! then, dear friend,—remember me.

AMOS.

For the Telegraph.

## ATONEMENT.

Continued.

Our first inquiry, in entering on the discussion of this subject, is, what are we to understand by atonement? As our author has given no definite account of this term, we regard his discourse defective in this particular. The following appears to us as the true account of the word atonement. The Hebrew word, which is here translated into the English language, by the word atonement, is *cofer*, and signifies, to cover. As a noun, it signifies, a covering. The Hebrew word atonement, was translated into the Septuagint by the seventy, by the Greek word *ilasmos*, which also must signify, a covering. This Greek word *ilasmos* is translated into our English Bibles, by the word atonement, or propitiation, or atonement then, we mean, that which in a given case makes it proper that just for God to exercise his mercy in forgiving sin. By a given case, I mean, on certain conditions, that is, on repentance and faith. These conditions being complied with, God is just and yet the justifier of him that believeth; on account of the atonement of his Son. Had no atonement been made, how could the sinner present himself to God, with any hope of acceptance, even had it been with repentance and faith?

Here it may be proper to notice, what I shall denominate an erroneous view of the atonement, that seems to have existed in the mind of the essayist; and which has given character to his entire essay. When considering the fourth part of his discourse, he maintains, that, "where atonement is made, the pardon of those for whom it is made, immediately and invariably follows." Here is advanced the same sentiment that

Taylor and Socinus have advanced in relation to the atonement. And so far as I am able to understand the subject, this error arises from confounding two distinct things, viz: atonement and reconciliation. So far as the atonement of the Son of God is understood by me, I undertake to show a difference between reconciliation and atonement. In relation to the atonement, made by the priests under the Jewish ritual, I shall consider, at length in another part of this Review. Atonement, I have said, is that which in a given case makes it proper and just for God to exercise his mercy in forgiving sin. An atonement does not necessarily imply forgiveness of sin, because the conditions on which atonement is made may not have been complied with. But there could have been no reconciliation without an atonement. Reconciliation also should not be confounded with atonement. The sinner is redeemed from sin and its final punishment, when he embraces, by faith, the blood of Christ, which made the atonement. Atonement and redemption stand in the same relation to each other, as cause and effect. Without atonement there could be no redemption; and when the sinner embraces the atonement, by faith in the blood of Christ, then he is redeemed. Hence we maintain in opposition to our essayist, that when atonement is made, the pardon of those by whom it is made does not immediately and invariably follow.

Having settled our first inquiry, viz: what are we to understand by atonement? let us now examine some proofs in favor of the opinion that the atonement was "made on Calvary," and "completed in the death of Christ." "It is not in the character of a suffering victim, that Christ makes the atonement," says our author, but in the character "of an officiating high priest." Yet he endeavors to show that it is the blood of Christ that makes the atonement, when presented on the throne in heaven, not "literally, but spiritually." In opposition to this doctrine, I shall undertake to prove, that Christ literally made an atonement for sin upon the cross, in the character of a suffering victim.—John i: 29, "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!" In what sense, can a lamb take away sin, unless it be, by way of sacrificial atonement? And what propriety would there be for John the Baptist to point to Jesus Christ as "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," unless he had reference to Christ's death upon the cross, to atone for the sins of the world? "He is called 'the Lamb of God,' as he was a sacrifice which God himself both required, provided, and accepted. As a Lamb he 'taketh away sin,' by being made an expiatory oblation, that justice might be satisfied, and yet the sinner pardoned." A Lamb could not "take away sin," except by becoming a sacrifice: and why should John call Christ "the Lamb of God," in this connexion, if he did not really atone for the sins of men, by bearing the punishment due to them?"—Scott. It must be noticed here, if this view of the subject be correct, that Christ made atonement for sin, in the character of a Lamb, or an expiatory oblation, as a "suffering victim," and not in the character "of an officiating high priest." John did not say, behold the man who is to be an "officiating high priest," to take away the sin of the world. "Behold the Lamb of God," that expiates, or takes away, "the sin of the world."

Where was this expiation made by the Lamb of God? What was done by him in that character, that we should regard as expiatory oblation, except the sacrifice of himself upon the tree? Isaiah liii: 5, "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." 1 Peter, ii: 24, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes we were healed." The doctrine of substitution is here as plainly declared, as language can express it. "He was wounded for our transgressions." "He was wounded," he hung upon the cross; he expired there as a victim to atone for sin, having endured all the agonies of a cruel crucifixion.—And as he hung upon the cross, a spear was thrust into his side, and thus, was he literally "wounded for our transgressions"—"by whose stripes we are healed," if we are healed at all. The sacrifice of Jesus Christ upon the cross opened a door of access to the Father, having nailed "the handwriting of ordinances that was against us," "to his cross."—"Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree." Here we see Christ becoming the propitiator for the sins of the world, "whom God set forth" by his own will and pleasure, in order "that He might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus."

Where was this propitiation made?—"On the tree." On the cross of Calvary. By what means was it done? By "his own body." By that body, which was prepared for him, which he assumed on earth, during the days of his incarnation.—Gal. iii: 13, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Here is a passage, that beautifully illustrates the doctrine of the atonement, as I under-

stand it. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." This was the work of the atonement, to satisfy the demands of a broken law, in order that the sinner, through faith in God, might be saved. While mankind were all threatened, by the law, with eternal condemnation, a way is opened, through the death of Christ, by which sinners may escape condemnation, and be restored to a blessed immortality. This atonement or propitiation was made, when Christ was "made a curse for us," as he hung upon the "tree." If these passages prove any thing, I am fully satisfied that they prove the proposition, that I have laid down, that Christ literally made an atonement for sin by his own blood upon the cross in the character of a suffering victim. There are many other passages of Scripture, which go to establish the truth of this position. Vide Rom. iii: 25, 26. 1 John ii: 2, 4, 10. Heb. x: 11, 12. Heb. ix: 28. Col. ii: 14. Eph. ii: 16, etc.

Having made these remarks by way of establishing the scriptural doctrine of the atonement, we are now prepared to enter more fully into the examination of our author's sentiments and mode of reasoning. The great principle that pervades the entire essay, and gives character to it, is founded on the typical sacrifices of the old dispensation. The writer lays down this principle in the following language: "It is an acknowledged point that there must be something in the antitype answering to every part of the type." Hence, if we ascertain what was represented, and what was ceremonially effected by the types in the Old Testament, we shall be prepared to understand what is effected by the antitype, and how it is done under the new dispensation." This principle is true, when properly defined and limited. Because, an antitype is nothing more nor less than one thing formed after the manner of another, called a type, or pattern.—Wherein, therefore, one object is formed like another, as its pattern, so far the object, so formed, may be said to be the antitype of the other. But, it may so happen, that one object may be formed like another, as its pattern, in some respects, and in other respects it may be unlike its type, or pattern. Yet there may be coincidences in both, to that extent, as to justify the mode of expression, that is used, when we say, that one object is the antitype of another. It is not safe, therefore, to reason, from the type to the antitype, expecting exact coincidences in both, in every respect, or expecting to find "something in the antitype answering to every part of the type." For example, the brazen figure of the flying fiery serpent, prepared by Moses, for the Israelites in the wilderness, is supposed to be a type of Christ. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up." Without enumerating the points of symbolical agreement between the brazen figure of the flying fiery serpent, and Jesus Christ, it is only necessary, to our present purpose, to show wherein they disagree.

In the first place, then, the brazen figure itself had no power to cure diseases. In this respect, therefore, the brazen figure was not a type of Christ; because Jesus Christ had "power on earth" to heal the sick, restore sight to the blind, cause the lame to walk, and make the deaf hear.—In the second place, the brazen figure, had no power to forgive sins. But Christ had "power on earth to forgive sins." "Come unto me all ye that labor, and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." Would it have been safe for one of the Israelites to reason from the brazen figure to its acknowledged antitype, and to make use of the unqualified language of our author, "that there must be something in the antitype answering to every part of the type?" No course, in our apprehension, could be pursued, that would lead one farther from the truth, than this very course. We therefore object, to the very principle, on which the doctrine under consideration is based. Nor can we account for his peculiar views, in any other way, than that he has adopted an erroneous principle at the onset of his discussion. The reader may not be surprised, therefore, if in the course of our remarks we should attempt to show that some passages of Scripture have been explained by our author, in a very erroneous and fanciful manner, in order to answer the demands of that sweeping apothegm, on which he has based all his peculiarity of sentiment. In reasoning from the type to the antitype he has laid down three things as preparatory to the atonement under the Jewish ritual, and has endeavored to prove that these three things apply equally to the atonement made by Christ. These preparatory things, are 1, an officiating high priest; 2, a suitable victim slain; 3, confession of sin on the part of those for whom it was to be made. These were preparatory to the atonement in the sacrifices made by the priests; but will the antitype of these sacrifices afford circumstances, answering to "every part of the type?" Let us notice, then that confession was made over the victim, before it was slain. Leviticus, iv: 4, 15. "And he shall bring the bullock unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord; and shall lay his hand upon the bullock's head, and kill the bullock before the Lord.—And the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock before the Lord; and the bullock shall be killed before the

Lord." Adopting the same principle of exegesis with our author, and regarding the laying of the hands upon the head of the victim, as confession; then it follows, that confession was made, not only before the atonement was made, but before even the sacrifice, preparatory to the atonement, was made. In every case, that I have examined, the hands were laid upon the head of the victim, before it was slain.—Now, if the mode of reasoning is correct, that our author has adopted; then we must look for "something in the antitype answering" to this part of the type.—Hence, we should infer, that there must be confession of sin, before Christ offered himself a sacrifice for sin. But this was impossible for those who have been saved since the death of Christ, and will also be impossible for all who shall believe in Christ in future. But if the want of confession hindered the high priest, from making a sacrifice, for sin, why will not the same thing hinder a sacrifice in the antitype? Here then we are met, with an insuperable obstacle, in the very threshold of our author's course. And this fact must strengthen our conviction that the principle on which he has founded his doctrine is radically wrong. So far as the analogy between type and antitype is involved, I undertake to say that we do no more violence to that analogy in maintaining that the atonement was made on the cross, than does our author himself.—Should his principle be admitted "that there must be something in the antitype answering to every part of the type," all we have to say, is, that he has violated his own rule, and we can do no more than violate it; for he that offendeth in one point is guilty of the whole.

That the different offerings, instituted for the observance of the Levitical priesthood, typify the great truth of Christ's sacrificial atonement, in one way or other, in a greater or less degree, I am ready to acknowledge. And, although this might have been one of the designs of the great Instructor of these rites, still, there are many other circumstances that must be noticed in this connexion. It has been well said by a learned critic, that "the fancy, if unreined, is apt to run into excess, and the interpretation of the ritual law, has been perhaps, too uncontrolled, particularly by its earlier expositors, who have sometimes built their explanations more on fanciful allusions, than on real analogy, and true connection. It may be remarked also, that some of these ceremonial laws seem to have been imposed as a punishment, on account of the frequent transgressions of rebellious people, or rather as a yoke or curb to restrain from idolatry, as well as to discriminate them from all other nations; which purpose they effectually served in all their dispersions and captivities." If our doctrine of the atonement is correct, that the atonement was made when Christ "bore our sins in his own body on the tree," the first position of our author must utterly fail him. And as we have not yet made sufficient advancement in the examination of our author's views, to find his arguments which overthrow this doctrine, let us now attend to the second position in the essay.

DALETH.

To be continued.

## PERSONAL EFFORT FOR THE SALVATION OF SOULS.

When the disciples of Christ are not in vigorous action for the salvation of sinners it frustrates an important part of the design of their conversion.

The chief end of God in conversion is the glory of his holy name, through Jesus Christ; but there are also to be answered subordinate ends, in the attainment of which, in truth, the accomplishment of the primary object is involved.—The first of these is the eternal blessedness of the sinner himself; the next is his utility as an instrument of converting others. Redeemed sinners are the very agents, and the only agents which the Almighty forms for the conversion of the world. He lights the candle that it may shed light around. He has seasoned us with grace, that we may season the earth. Let it be set down by us, therefore, as a certain and weighty truth, that our usefulness in the salvation of others was the second, and but the second great end he contemplated in our own. It is one of the grand methods by which he has designed us to show forth his praise.

Now nothing can be more binding, and nothing ought to be more delightful, than to fall in with God's design respecting us, and to fulfill the good pleasure of his will. The force of all the mercy, the rich and unspeakable mercy, which he has shown us, leads us in this direction, according to the language of the apostle, "I beseech you brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye yield yourselves a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable, which is your reasonable service."—Rom. xii. 1. "for ye are not your own; for ye are bought with a price; wherefore, glorify God with your spirits, which are God's."—1 Cor. vi. 20. In agreement with this exhortation are the aspirations of every renewed heart; with Saul ready to ask, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"—Acts ix. 6; and with him ready to reply, "The love of Christ constraineth me; because I thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that those who live should henceforth not live unto themselves, but unto him that died for them,

and rose again."—2 Cor. v. 14, 15. And such have been the vows, if they have been any thing better than hypocrisy, which we have been often presented to our adorable Redeemer at his throne, and at his table.

Can we then bear to think that there is any part of his will concerning us which we do not fulfil; that in any line of activity he has marked out for us we are sluggish and ineffective? Is this our fidelity to the vows we have so frequently implored him to accept? Is this our evidence of grace? Is this our kindness to our friend, and the return we are content to make him for his love? Forbid it, all that is influential in gratitude, or faithful in friendship, or sincere in piety.

But if there be force in such a reflection in reference to any part of God's will, how much more when it applies to a particular of pre-eminent magnitude! Our activity for the conversion of others is no trivial thing with him. Next to our own salvation, it is the chief end for which he has called us by his grace, and it is the grand use to which he has intended to put us in the world. It is an object of the utmost importance in his view, and of the highest glory to his name; an object on which he has concentrated all the counsels of eternity, on which he has expended the amplest resources of his nature, for which he has poured forth the blood of his Son, and to which he is bending the whole administration of his providence.—And is it to his purpose in such a point as this that we can be indifferent? Is it here that we fail to sympathize with him, or are slow in coming forth to his help? Is it to the losing of our savior that we can by any possibility be reconciled, and to an entire unfitness for the intended and blessed process of seasoning with grace a corrupted world? Alas! if it be so, our hearts are not right with God; and whatever portion of such a spirit there may be in us, it ought to be a matter of deep humiliation before him.—Hinton

From the Mother's Magazine.

## VIGOROUS EFFORT.

Dear Madam,—I have been much impressed of late, with the importance of early accustoming our children to vigorous effort in whatever they undertake.

I have, under my care, a youth twelve years of age, whose early habits have been much neglected. He has been brought up in a southern climate, where but little effort is required, and with the confirmed habits of twelve years, it is a difficult, I had almost said, an impossible task for him to employ his mind with intensity upon any study or engage in bodily effort without lagging. After breakfast, he has been placed at work out of doors, which could easily be accomplished in an hour. When the dinner hour arrived, his labor was still unfinished, and it seemed to satisfy his mind, that he had been at his post all of the morning, while completing the task was no part of his ambition. His lessons are in a like case;—difficult portions are passed over as unattainable, and time spent upon the book takes the place of learning the lesson.—Ambition seems to be out of the question, and the desire of pleasing me, fails of accomplishing its end. That much of this want of energy arises from the mistaken kindness of parents I have not a doubt; who save their children even the smallest effort by their own hard exertions, but thereby deprive them of that necessary experience of patience, fortitude, and perseverance, which forms the ground work of the most estimable characters. Man is, indeed, a bundle of habits; and the habit of overcoming difficulties in the nursery, is of importance, inasmuch as it becomes in the man, the energy of a Fulton or a Landner.

A short time since, there appeared in that excellent little work, the Youth's Friend, a story of three boys, called Nolo, Nequeo, and Tentabo. Latin names, for "I won't," "I can't," and "I will try." Nolo turned out as you would suppose for a disobedient son invariably comes to a bad end. Nequeo was not much better; always despairing of success, before he had made the attempt, he lived poor, despondent, and self-condemned. Tentabo was the only one of the three who made a useful and respectable man. Since perusing this story, I have endeavored to make Tentabo of all my children. Whatever they undertake, whether to wind a skein of silk, to hem a pocket-handkerchief, to unravel a sum in arithmetic, or compose a letter, they are not allowed to renounce it as impossible. "I can't" is excluded from their vocabulary. All the great events which history has recorded, have been accomplished by a spirit of persevering zeal.

The motto, "We will try," inspired our pilgrim fathers, when they crossed our pilgrim fathers, when they crossed that trackless ocean; and it gave birth to that Declaration which proclaimed our country's Independence. The Apostle to the Gentiles, said, "I can do all things, through Christ, which strengtheneth me." What a comment is this, upon the excuses of Christians in our day, who shrink from duty under the pretext of humility, and follow not their Master, because, as they say, "they are not competent." When Moses made excuses of this sort, the Lord sharply rebuked him, saying, "Who hath made man's mouth? or who maketh the dumb or deaf? or the seeing or the blind? have not I, the Lord?"

Now therefore go, and I will be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say." This strength, vouchsafed to Moses and to Paul, is graciously proffered to us, and the more we can teach our children to act under its guidance, the better will our plans for their improvement prosper.

I would by no means assert that children are to be left to encounter difficulties alone. Parents should be as "pioneers to smooth their rugged path!" Is a child required to make its first effort at composition? How easy for the parent to read an interesting story, and permit the child to put on paper, what she can recollect of it. Or, at a more advanced age, the parent can afford a subject, with its heads and outlines, illustrated by interesting hints and anecdotes, and, with this assistance, the child easily fills up the picture. It is important that maternal watchfulness should guide and direct every effort which children are required to make. A friend mentioned to me that when a boy of eight years of age, he was placed at a school of some celebrity, a thousand miles from home. Here he was required to write, at stated periods, to his guardian, a gentleman of high standing, wealth, and influence. Upon one occasion, having nothing to say, he retired with his pen, ink, and paper, to the stair-case, in order to avoid the noise of his companions, where he fidgeted from one step to another, hoping that each would produce some idea.—But change of place produced no change in the barrenness of his head, and he retired in despair to a bed-room, where he accidentally found a book of letters, written by a reverend gentleman, to a young friend just commencing life. From these he chose the first which came to hand, and after carefully copying it, despatched it to his guardian, congratulating himself on his success in letter-writing. Three weeks after, an answer was returned to the individual under whose care he was, (with a copy of the boy's letter enclosed,) containing a most severe rebuke; for, upon examination, it was found that the little fellow had given his guardian a long lecture upon morality, honesty, integrity of character, and uprightness in all his dealings. Here the object, that is, the writing of the letter, was attained; but as no judicious hand directed the effort, perhaps it had better not have been accomplished.

Let us, then, be careful to insist upon effort in the nursery, and at the same time to direct it. The habit of overcoming difficulties here will, in after life, show itself. If, perchance, the Spirit of God should create in the mind a desire to proclaim "glad tidings" in the dark places of the earth, the energy of the man will cause him to smile at the obstacle of river, mountain, or trackless sea; nay, though greater obstacles than these present themselves, he will say, "I am ready, not to be bound only, but to die for the name of the Lord Jesus." AMICA.

January 25, 1836.

## RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

The love of religious liberty is a stronger sentiment, when fully excited, than an attachment to civil and political freedom.—That freedom which the conscience commands, and which men feel bound by their hopes of salvation to contend for, can hardly fail to be attained. Conscience is the cause of religion, and the worship of the Deity prepares the mind to act and to suffer, beyond all other causes. It sometimes gives impulse so irresistible, that no fetters of power or of opinion can withstand it.

History instructs that this love of religious liberty, is a compound sentiment of the breast of man, made up of the clearest sense of right, and the highest conviction of duty, is able to look the sternest despotism in the face, and with means apparently most inadequate, to shake principalities and powers. There is a boldness of spirit and daring, in religious reformers, not to be measured by the general rules which control men's purposes and actions. If the hand of power be laid upon it, this only seems to augment its force and elasticity, and to cause its action to be more formidable and terrible. Human invention has devised nothing, human power has compassed nothing, that can forcibly restrain it, when it breaks forth.—Nothing can stop it, nothing can check it but indulgence. It loses its power only when it has gained its object.

The principle of toleration to which the world has come so slowly, is at once the most wise of principles. Even when religious feelings take a character of extravagance and enthusiasm, and seem to threaten the order of society, and shake the columns of the social edifice, its principal danger is in its restraint. If it be allowed indulgence and expansion, like the elemental fires, it only agitates and purifies the atmosphere, while its efforts to throw off restraint would burst the world asunder. Thanks be to God, that our country was honored as the asylum of religious liberty.

May its standard, reared here, remain forever! May it raise up as high as heaven, till its banner shall fan the air of both continents, and wave as a glorious ensign of peace and security to the nations. DANIEL WEBSTER.

This may be considered an universal maxim—As is the teacher, so is the school.